



Library Building Task Force #5 Minutes

October 2, 2017, 5:30 PM
Pond House

Meeting called by: Angel Falconer, Chair

Task Force members: Rebecca Banyas, Angel Falconer; Ernestina Fuenmayor; Mayor Mark Gamba; Paul Klein; Julie Lund; Ervin Miller; Melissa Perkins, Nancy Tice

Task Force members absent: Ryan Healy

City Staff present: Ann Ober, City Manager; Haley Fish, Finance Director; Robert Lanxon, Librarian; Nancy Wittig, Library Supervisor

City Staff absent: Alma Flores, Community Development Director; Katie Newell, Library Director

PlanB Consultancy (PlanB): Amy Winterowd

Hacker Architects (Hacker): David Keltner; Laura Klinger; Tyler Nishitani

Call to order: Angel Falconer called the meeting to order at 5:35 p.m.

Discussion items

1. Approval of minutes. The September 6, 2017 meeting minutes were approved as written.
2. Current Refined Design Options. Laura Klinger, Project Manager from Hacker, began by again sharing the Project Vision which consists of four (4) points:
 - **People** : Creates a welcoming, civic focal point that promotes education and understanding of Milwaukie's culture, community and history.
 - **Prosperity** : Provides an innovative, state-of-the-art, future-thinking library that supports both community and individual endeavors.
 - **Planet** : Its sustainable architectural design integrates the surrounding landscape and is a model of stewardship that seeks to enhance the natural environment.
 - **Place** : Provides a vibrant community information hub that brings people together, stimulates imagination and enriches lives.

Laura then shared background on an activity the Library Project Team completed. The exercise was to select imagery that was felt to best represent what was wanted in a library. Laura showed these images along with words that

the Project Team provided post image selection to describe why they chose those words. The images and associated words are shown below:



Laura then updated the Task Force on where the project is relative to the schedule. At this point, the project is at about the middle of schematic design. If all goes smoothly with the rest of the process, including permitting, the project is anticipated to go into construction in June of 2018 with opening in Summer of 2019. Laura then turned it over to Tyler Nishitani, Project Architect with Hacker, to provide a summary of the project team's pre-application meeting.

Tyler expressed that the team learned a lot during the meeting and that the meeting itself was mostly positive. He shared the following important points:

- Natural Resource Disturbance
 - The team understands there is the potential for a higher level of scrutiny as our project is likely to follow review of a private project which was recently denied and had some similar natural resource disturbance issues.
 - It will be important to show design alternatives with a priority order of avoiding, minimizing and then mitigating. The expectation will be that our project has no negative impact and preferably ultimately creates better conditions for the site.
 - The Scott Park Master Plan will be concurrently updated – our team can reference the amount of Water Quality Resource (WQR) intrusion from the old master plan.
 - Any new trails, designed to park standards, would not count as a natural resource disturbance.
- Parking

- Under code, the maximum allowable number of parking spaces for our project is 24. We can apply for a variance which would need to be approved by the Planning Director.
- A professional traffic/parking study would not necessarily be required nor is it typical.
- The team was advised that the quantity proposed should “work for the use” – in this case for both the library and the park.
- 21st Avenue
 - North of Harrison, 21st Avenue is not intended to be a dedicated road in the current plan. In the interest of the project, 21st would be best left undedicated with easements for access to utilities and include drive aisles.
 - An apron (the portion connecting the driveway to the sidewalk or main street) with a material change would be required at Harrison.
- Fire Access
 - We have a dead end access way situation. There is a 150' maximum and we can use the apartment driveway as long as it is close to meeting the vehicle turnaround requirements.
 - The hose length maximum can be increased by including a sprinkler system – as long as the sprinkler system is not otherwise required to build the building. More clarification on this issue is required.

This concluded Tyler's summary.

Rebecca Banyas asked which officials were present at the pre-application meeting. Tyler answered that there were two (2) representatives from the planning department, one (1) from the building department, City engineers and a County fire official.

Tyler then turned the presentation over to David Keltner, Design Principal with Hacker.

David gave a brief overview of where the project was a month ago at the last task force meeting and then reviewed the one-story “sliding/double bar” scheme that was shown at the pre-application meeting.

- This particular plan got its boundaries from the protection of the large tree to the south and in trying to preserve the existing parking lot.
- Preserving these elements pushed the building east into the WQR delineation line.
- This concept also created a corner that would likely be a service entry, but patrons arriving at the library might naturally gravitate towards that point as though it was the main library entry.
- From an urban design standpoint, this concept didn't preserve sightlines for Scott Park. And overall, the plan wasn't as pedestrian friendly.

Between these issues and the pre-application meeting, the Hacker team took a step back and looked at inspirational ideas. One strong element for the City of Milwaukie are the bodies of water – Johnson Creek, Kellogg Creek, the Willamette River, and Spring Creek. David spoke about how rivers meander and

create reaches – the bends in the river – and how each reach has a different space and feel. This got the design team thinking about what would happen if the library program could be broken into reaches.

This led to an idea to change the shape of the building, remaining mindful of the large oak preservation, minimizing our disturbance of the WQR, as well as to make for a more pedestrian-friendly approach for the building and Scott Park. The result was a chevron-like shape where the acute point hit at a place where there is a natural break in the trees.

This new scheme:

- Allows head-in parking over the current double-loaded parking. Head-in parking is safer for visitors as no one would need to cross into a lane of traffic to get to the library or the park.
- Provides sightlines of the entire length of the library and clearer direction towards Scott Park.
- Keeps the main entry of the library obvious.
- Has the administrative, service and support spaces along the west, which allows the big open spaces to be on the east where the trees and Spring Creek can be highlighted.
- Is effective in minimizing the disturbance of the natural resources to about 0.5%. This is accomplished by both moving primarily out of the WQR, restoring some area that the existing Ledding Library would no longer occupy, and discounting the other existing area of the Ledding Library. It is possible that the design team may be able to get the disturbance to zero.

David then took the basic chevron-shape and showed three explorations of how the program might layout.

Option 1: Puts the Children's Collection along Harrison and 21st and the Adult Collection to the north portion. Option 1 showed a secure outdoor area and the Community Room along the east, looking out towards the creek.

Option 2: Puts the Children's Collection on the north, adjacent to the amphitheater, with the Adult Collection to the south and the Community Room along the west. The Children's area would have a more flexible space so that if book shelves were on casters, the shelves could be moved and together with the community room, allow for larger programs.

Option 3: Puts the Children's Collection on the north, adjacent to the amphitheater with the Adult Collection to the south and the Community Room along the east. This concept also had a flex space near the Children's collection and Community Room.

Haley Fish pointed out that in all layouts, the Children's Collection, Community Room and centralized spaces are kept together to allow for flexibility and expansion with story time and larger Children's programs as well as to serve as a natural buffer for the Children's area to be separate from the adult section.

Nancy Tice asked if Option 1 was the only one to offer an outdoor space. David and Laura answered that yes, Option 1 is the only one showing an outdoor space, but that outdoor spaces could be put into any of the schemes.

Ervin Miller observed that Option 3 seemed to have another kink in the shape. David acknowledged how astute that observation was and that additional variations could be put almost anywhere if it was desired.

Ervin pointed out that the sharp point on the east echoes the current overlook.

Laura then provided a summary of comments from the Project Team's meeting a few days earlier:

- Liked the new "chevron" shape, its sensitivity to the site, and the simplicity of the parking design.
- Prefers the children's area adjacent to Scott Park. The park often has programming that can be loud, making it odd to place the quiet area of the adult section next to the park.
- Prefers to keep the Community Room on the west side to preserve the views of the park for all day library use.
- Likes the Community Room having the flexibility to connect to the Children's area
- Likes the secure outdoor space, but it may not be the best use of space for all year round activities

Based on these comments, Option 2 was looking to be the more preferred concept to continue exploring.

Nancy Wittig added that the library loves the architects; that they have done an excellent job of developing the project and the iterations have been greatly informative.

Ervin likes the idea of the Children's Collection towards Scott Park to draw more people throughout the library.

Rebecca Banyas queried about the multiple "service areas" shown in the plans. Laura and Tyler explained that these "service areas" were generically marked and are placeholders for support spaces for the children's collection, support spaces for the adult collection, mechanical rooms, etc.

Rebecca further commented that the Teens didn't seem to be getting the same kind of exposure to natural light based on the location in all the plans. Laura commented that the Teens tend to like a more "cave-like" environment. At Fort Vancouver, the teen area is completely interior with no windows to the outside and the teens love that space. They would still have access to natural light, but with a glass wall that would face the bulk of the natural light as well as potentially smaller windows on the west.

Julie Lund asked Hacker, as designers of a large amount of libraries, if there was any sense of if one program over another at the street view would draw more traffic into the library. Laura answered that it didn't seem to make a difference

which program was there, but that wrapping the corner with glass for views in would be helpful in either case.

David then continued presenting further exploration of Option 2. In this scheme, the design team tried turning the entry so that rather than facing 21st, it faced out towards Harrison as a way to engage the street view even better. This scheme showed a kid's bathroom and also had a tucked area in the Children's area dipping to the west that could potentially be used for story time.

Mayor Gamba asked how much farther the entrance in these plans was from the current existing entry. David answered that it might be another 20 feet away. Tyler added that the design team is trying to celebrate the entry walkway, potentially incorporating the fountain.

Both Mayor Gamba and Rebecca were interested in whether Hacker had explored the idea of the main entry at Harrison. David answered that the design team uses the entry as a mechanism to help divide the program. Locating the entry at a more central point of the building prevents patrons from having to walk completely through one element of program in order to reach another program.

The Mayor then raised a devil's advocate point, that as a kid, he wandered through the adult stacks to get to the children's section and wonders if part of that is what instilled his curiosity and love of reading. He acknowledged he had to be very quiet going through the adult area. The group mulled this point over but did not come to any conclusions.

David then continued to an exploration of the shape of the building.

The team knows that the building needs to be simple, but not simple-minded. In that spirit, Hacker and Swinerton have been collaborating and discussing ways to provide visual interest while being mindful of the cost.

The team showed a simple way to achieve a dynamic roof form by making one end of the building higher and cascading down on the west and flipping this same idea on the east. The simple height differences create a fluid roof form, somewhat akin to the fluidity of water. The team showed the Minneapolis Rowing Club Boathouse as an example of a project that does this and what it accomplished visually.

The team then showed additional explorations of ways to play with height differentials to achieve different roof forms.

David then showed simple, unfinished renderings of what the interior space could look like, playing with height differentials as well as differences in finishes – post and beam (a more unfinished look which is popular and is a nice nod to the trees, shows the undulating forms but also exposes sprinklers, lights, ducts and acoustical material); or the roof could be built with trusses (cover the bottoms of the trusses with boards, leave acoustical separation space and much of the “guts” of the building would be covered).

The Mayor commented he liked the post and beam.

Ervin commented that from a security standpoint, having glass along the pond side is smart.

Angel Falconer commented that she likes the elevation of the roof line and the visuals some of these options could create.

Ervin asked if the library staff were worried about visual sightlines since some of the schemes showed tucks in the program. Robert Lanxon answered that the existing library has lots of corners. So long as the desk placement was done well, it would address the visual sightline concerns.

Julie commented that she likes the exposed wood.

Ervin commented that he preferred the non-exposed. This is partially informed from recent experience with the School District where they kept it exposed but it is an acoustical nightmare.

Ernestina commented that part of the experience will depend on the materials chosen.

Ervin commented that flooring choice certainly plays a large role in the acoustics.

Angel commented that the largest voices of concern she keeps hearing about is to ensure that whatever is done with the project, that it is bird-friendly.

Ann Ober commented that it will be important also to be maintenance-friendly and that she would like to see easy access for upgrading systems.

Ernestina commented that she really likes the roof lines – visually, they look like a butterfly.

David went back briefly to address Ann's comments on maintenance, stating that exterior materials such as wood cladding have proven longevity. Stained rough-sawn cedar lasts the longest and through the initial re-seal applications come at three (3) years and then seven (7) years and then the cedar goes for a long time without re-application.

Ann said it would be important to look at the maintenance schedule for appropriate budgeting.

Rebecca asked what other types of cladding might also be maintenance friendly. David answered that metal would work within the budget. Many other materials like brick, CMU, etc are also durable but may be cost prohibitive. The cedar is a nice linkage back to the park.

Angel and the Mayor both like how the cedar could tie back to the trees.

Laura confirmed with the group that the same presentation given at today's Task Force meeting would be given at the Community Meeting on October 4, 2017. In addition, there would be printed boards of the options with adjacent boards to capture comments.

Rebecca complimented the team on the first Community Meeting as she felt having multiple speakers kept people engaged.

3. Outreach Efforts. Haley Fish relayed that part of the Task Force Committee's role was to help with outreach. We have a series of Neighborhood District Associations (NDA) that we would like to speak with about the Library project. Haley asked that the Task Force help by attending the various NDA meetings.

Angel commented that when the Task Force was formed, part of the criteria was to make sure each neighborhood had representation. So if each committee member could commit to attend at least one of their own NDA meetings, we would be covered. The task force agreed to this.

Haley passed around a schedule of the next two meetings for each NDA. Some coordination will need to happen to ensure that we have task force member, city and project team representation at each as well as the presentation materials. Angel agreed to be the main point of contact for the task force and will coordinate with Haley, Amy Winterowd and Katie Newell.

4. Updated Project Schedule. Amy provided the task force with an updated schedule for Task Force Committee and Community Meetings. The dates are as follows:

Community Meeting #2	October 4, 2017	6:00 – 8:00 p.m.
Task Force Meeting #6	November 16, 2017	5:30 – 6:30 p.m.
Task Force Meeting #7	January 11, 2018	5:30 – 6:30 p.m.
Community Meeting #3	January 18, 2018	6:00 – 8:00 p.m.
Task Force Meeting #8	February 27, 2018	5:30 – 6:30 p.m.
Task Force Meeting #9	April 19, 2018	5:30 – 6:30 p.m.
Community Meeting #4	April 24, 2018	6:00 – 8:00 p.m.
Task Force Meeting #10	May 29, 2018	5:30 – 6:30 p.m.

Follow-up from last meeting notes: There were no comments to the follow-up items.

Public comment: There was no public comment.

Adjournment: Angel adjourned the meeting at 6:46 p.m.